

REMARKS

This amendment is responsive to the Office Action dated May 4, 2005. Claims 1 - 6 are pending in this application and have been rejected. Reexamination is respectfully requested in light of the foregoing amendments.

These remarks follow the order of the detailed Office Action beginning at page 2 thereof.

The Examiner has objected to the drawings because they fail to show an "angle ring", a "sheath" or "metal frame". Applicant wishes the Examiner to note that term "angle ring" appears at paragraph [0018], line 2 and that the word "metal frame" appears at paragraph [0018], line 3.

The sheath metal member accommodates the inside department material of the endoscope. That is, the sheath metal member is composed of a ring-like metal member (16A) including an angle ring in an insertion section, a metal member (16B) such as metal frame in an operation section, and a ring-like metal member (16C) in a cable section. The above angle ring is a part of the insertion section and is the one that is connected to the ring like metal member so as to bend the leading end of the endoscope. The above metal frame (16B) accommodates and holds the components inside the operation section.

With respect to the term "sheath" Applicant respectfully submits that this specification clearly describes a sheath as comprising 16A, B and C. This is found at paragraph [0028], top

of page 11, at paragraph [0020], lines 3 - 4, and at [0025], line 10. Since sheath is described in the specification, it is respectfully submitted that the drawings do not require amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §112

The Examiner has again objected to the terms in the claims as not being adequately described in the specification. These terms include "angle ring" and "metal frame" which are explained above.

The Examiner has also objected to the terms "processor device" "Housing ground processor device" and "angle ring" as being unconventional. Applicant has amended claim 1 to more accurately describe the invention. In this Amendment, applicant states that the processor device has a grounded housing to which the scope was connected. This is believed to overcome the rejection and make the claim definite. This amendment also does not require amendment in the drawings because the drawings as originally filed show this ground as (23G) in Figure 1 and 2.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102

Claims 1 - 6 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Tsuji et al., '197. In this rejection, the Examiner has asserted that capacitor C2 (or even capacitor C1) would provide the claimed static electricity suppressing part.

Capacitors, however, provide for a conductive path only when there is an alternating current alternating voltage applied to the capacitor. Capacitors do not conduct direct current. By definition, a static charge is a direct voltage, and not an alternating voltage. This is confirmed by '197 at column 8, beginning at line 35 where it states:

"Besides, the noises tend to intermix. The metal frame (82) can, however, be held AC-wise at an impedance as low as GND of the second circuit (35) owing to the capacitor C2."

This shows that in the teachings of '197, the capacitor C2 does not hold the metal frame (85) to the potential of secondary circuit (35) with respect to DC. It is only an AC connection.

In Tsuji '197, it is the shielding cover line (84a, 84b, 84c in Figure 9) of a transmission line, to connect to the ground of (85). These shielding covers are not the sheath metal members of the invention of claims 1 and 5 as now amended. Second, '197 is a noise-control measure and not a static-electricity-control measure.

The Examiner has pointed to connections or shield cover lines (84a, 84b, 84c). The Examiner has also relied upon portions of the paragraph beginning at column 8, line 1 and continuing through column 8, line 25. This paragraph begins with reference to a connector receiver (26) of the CCU (4) to which the connector (25) of Figure 6 is connected. However, (26) is shown in Figure 1. Reference numeral (26) is a connector receiver to which shields are connected to the ground of patient

circuit (30). The ground of patient circuit (30) is shown in Figure 2. The ground of patient circuit (30), however, is never connected to the ground of the secondary circuit (35) except through either capacitor C4, or possibly, capacitor C2 and C3. As shown in Figure 8, capacitors C2 and C3 connect to chassis (86), which is a ground for circuit (35). There is no direct wire connecting the shields of any input from the cable to (35). There is always isolation as shown by isolators (34), (45), (46) and capacitor C4, etc.

The purpose of '197 is to provide isolation, not static electricity suppression. If static electricity suppression were to be provided, '197 would connect to a ground of circuit portion (35). However, '197 teaches that this is to be avoided because if no isolation is effected by the isolation means, a human body could be injured by the endoscope (see column 1, lines 35 - 46). Still further, the purpose of use of capacitors in '197 and the use of only AC coupling is found in column 1, lines 48 - 55 where '197 teaches that the grounds of the patient circuit and secondary circuit are not made common by the isolation means. On the other hand, '197 simply provides nothing which could provide for isolation as claimed by Applicant.

The only way '197 can provide isolation is if the capacitor fails (breaks down and provides a direct conductive path to ground). '197 does not teach that the capacitors should fail.

Referring again to column 8, lines 1 - 25, it is seen that

the cylindrical frame portion (81), the structure of Figure 9, and the 1 point connection to ground of patient circuit (30) are for the purpose of preventing the generation of unnecessary radiant noises). However, when one studies this paragraph and the drawings carefully, it become clear that the connector (25) shown in Figure 6 is the same as connector (24) shown in Figure 4. This is made clear by the fact that at the top of column 8 it states that the connector receiver (26) is connected to the connector (25) shown in Figure 6. Therefore, the designated number (24) in Figure 4 is clearly incorrect. In Figure 1, it shows (25) connected to (26).

Referring now to Figures 6 and 7, it is shown that all of the shields are connected to a metal cylinder (72) of the connector (25). Metal cylinder (72) in turn makes contact with connector receiver (26) and is connected by capacitor C2 to chassis ground (35).

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner asserts that static electricity part includes the lead wires (85) and conductor (83) between the sheath metal member of the scope and a ground terminal. However, the ground terminal the Examiner refers to, is a terminal of the patent circuit, not a ground terminal of the secondary circuit (35). Simply stated, it is not a ground terminal because of the capacitor coupling between the two separate sections (30) and (35).


The difference between this structure and Applicant's

structure also can be seen in reference to Applicant's Figure 1 where it is shown that Applicant's static electricity suppressing part (25) is connected directly between a metallic ring (shield) and a ground (23G) of the housing which contains the processor.

Stated another way, instead of the cover lines (84a, 84b and 84c) comprising a static electricity suppressing part, these provide only a connection which is prior to a capacitor C2 or a capacitor C1 or capacitor C4. The capacitors necessarily prevent the static electricity from escaping.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance, and early action in accordance thereof is requested. In the event there is any reason why the application cannot be allowed in this current condition, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned at the number listed below to resolve any problems by Interview or Examiner's Amendment.

Respectfully submitted,


Ronald R. Snider
Reg. No. 24,962

Date: August 3, 2005

Snider & Associates
Ronald R. Snider
P.O. Box 27613
Washington, D.C. 20038-7613
(202) 347-2600

RRS/bam